



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/693,292	10/24/2003	Simon Hunt	00-625-F	4135
20306 7590 09/10/2009 MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP 300 S. WACKER DRIVE 32ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606				
EXAMINER SWEARINGEN, JEFFREY R				
ART UNIT 2445		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 09/10/2009		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/693,292

Applicant(s)

HUNT ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey R. Swearingen

Art Unit

2445

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

3DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 7/7/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant did not provide a complete claim set. Claims 1-10 were listed, but claims 11-22 were not listed. Because of this, the Office has assumed that Claims 11-22 have been cancelled.
3. Applicant argues that because Halahmi requires conversion of email messages, Halahmi fails to teach determining whether to transform information content at a server from a first data format to a second data format and sending the information content to a client device in the first data format or the second data format. In column 6, lines 10-18, Halahmi "optionally convert[s] the received message directly to the specific file format which is suitable for wireless communication device 12." This is determining whether to transform information content at a server from a first data format to a second data format. Column 6, lines 26-43 details "prepar[ing] the message in a suitable, specific data format for transmission to wireless communication device 12...E-mail portion server 26 then sends the formatted message to wireless communication device 12 for display." This is "sending the information content to a client device in the first data format or the second data format." In this case, the information content is sent to the client device in the "second data format". This is all the claim requires.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Halahmi (US 6,684,088).
6. In regard to claim 1, Halahmi disclosed:

A method for optimizing display of information content on a client device, the method comprising: column 4, lines 49-60

receiving at a server a request from the client device for information content;
column 5, lines 43-44

receiving at a server the information content in a first data format from an information source; column 5, line 58 – column 6, line 9

determining an efficiency with which the client device can process the information content when the information content is stored in the first data format versus when the information content is stored in a second data format, wherein the first data format does not involve the server applying cascading style sheet pre-processing to the information content, and the second data format involves the server applying cascading style sheet pre-processing to the information content; column 6, lines 10-18. CSS support is provided in column 11, line 56.

determining the transmission capabilities of a wireless communication link used to send the information content to the client device; column 11, line 45

based on the efficiency with which the client device can process the information content in the first and second data formats, and the transmission capabilities of the wireless communication link, determining whether to transform the information content at the server from the first data format to the second data format; and column 6, lines 10-43

sending the information content to the client device in the first data format or the second data format. Column 6, lines 26-43

7. In regard to claim 2, Halahmi disclosed:

determining that the wireless communication link has changed and a second wireless communication link is being used to send the information content to the client device; and column 11, line 45

using a pre-set transformation mode associated with the second wireless communication link to determining whether to transform the information content at the server from the first data format to the second data format. Column 11, lines 26-45; column 6, lines 1-9

8. In regard to claim 3, Halahmi disclosed:

determining whether to send the information content to the client device in the first data format or the second data format comprises determining whether to send the information content to the client device with no content transformations. Column 6, lines 1-9; column 11, lines 26-57

9. In regard to claim 4, Halahmi disclosed:

when the wireless communication link allows for high bandwidth communication, sending the information content to the client device in the first data format as received from the information source; and column 11, line 45

when the wireless communication link allows for low bandwidth communication, transforming the information content in the first data format or the second data format based on the transmission capabilities. Column 11, lines 26-45

10. In regard to claim 5, Halahmi disclosed:

the client device detecting the transmission capabilities of the wireless communication link and switching between receiving the information content in the first data format or the second data format based on the transmission capabilities. Column 11, lines 26-45

11. In regard to claim 8, Halahmi disclosed:

determining whether to transform the information content from the first data format to the second data format further comprises considering criteria specified by a user of the client device. column 11, lines 35-36

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halahmi in view of Nevo et al. (US 6,928,266).

14. In regard to claims 6-7, Halahmi disclosed the Halahmi invention operated over a wireless network using WAP. Halahmi, column 5, lines 23-48. Halahmi failed to disclose the use of the IEEE 802.11b protocol for wireless transmission. Halahmi disclosed the use of the Wireless Access Protocol. Halahmi, column 5, line 41. Nevo disclosed various wireless protocols are used for communication between network devices. These protocols included Home RF, known as the Shared Wireless Access Protocol (SWAP) and the IEEE 802.11b standard. Nevo, column 1, lines 14-31, background. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was aware that IEEE 802.11b was a standardized wireless protocol for transmitting data over a wireless network. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the 802.11b wireless protocol with Halahmi in order to allow faster data transfer and to allow connection with 802.11b servers.

15. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halahmi in view of Beyda et al. (US 6,275,850).

16. In regard to claims 9-10, Halahmi failed to disclose determining times to transform and transmit the data in order to send the data to the client device. Beyda disclosed a method of determining whether an attachment should be downloaded with an email to a client device. Beyda, column 2, lines 29-41. Beyda took into account the maximum download time of the file when determining whether to transmit the attachment to the client device. Beyda, column 2, lines 51-63, column 7, lines 14-22. It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use time (Beyda, column 7, lines 14-22) as one of the properties to determine how data would be transmitted in Halahmi (column 11, lines 26-57) in order to prevent network congestion and deliver data efficiently to the end user.

Conclusion

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey R. Swearingen whose telephone number is (571)272-3921. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on 571-272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey R. Swearingen
Examiner
Art Unit 2445

/J. R. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 2445

/VIVEK SRIVASTAVA/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2445